

**Exhibit B**

From: "Bonlender, Brian" <Brian.Bonlender@mail.house.gov>  
To: "'Joseph Wilson ( thewilsonswdc@hotmail.com)'"  
<thewilsonswdc@hotmail.com>  
Subject: FW: Draft 3: Plame relief  
Date: Thu, 3 Nov 2005 18:25:02 -0500

Ambassador,

I'm following up with our previous discussions regarding a personal bill for Valerie, to allow her to retire with full benefits before she is 50 years of age.

Please see the draft bill attached.

A few questions to consider:

1. Are you both still inclined to do this?
2. Are there any changes that you would like to see to the attached draft?
3. If you want to proceed, are there some timing issues we should consider?
4. Do you know of any Republican members of Congress who may be willing to be an original cosponsor of this with Jay?

I think there is an outside chance that the Republican Leadership will take this bill up in an effort to subtly distance themselves from the WH on this problem. It would certainly be smart for them to do so. I think it is obviously the right thing to do, and we may be able to apply some pressure to the R's to do it once the bill is introduced.

I saw at least one article, I think it may have been USA Today, that talked about Valerie's current situation at work - with no chance for advancement in areas that require covert status, and some complications with coworkers due to the heavy media attention. If we proceed, those articles will be helpful in making the case for the legislation.

I know you have been rather busy as of late, so just contact me when you have the time (although I'm not sure I have a good email address for you here, so if you could confirm that you've received this, it will save me from bothering you on the phone).

Thanks, and keep up the good work. I still can't believe that the press keeps asking accusatory questions to you...your comeback to Wolf Blitzer the other day was good, asking him when he planned to ask the tough questions to Bush Administration officials.

Take care,

Brian Bonlender

Chief of Staff

Congressman Jay Inslee

[www.house.gov/inslee](http://www.house.gov/inslee) <<http://www.house.gov/inslee>>

202-225-6311

<< INSLER\_074\_XML.PDF >>

F:\M9\INSLEE\INSLEE\_074.XML

H.L.C.

(Original Signature of Member)

109TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

**H. R.** \_\_\_\_\_

For the relief of Valerie Plame Wilson.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. INSLEE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee  
on \_\_\_\_\_

**A BILL**

For the relief of Valerie Plame Wilson.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 **SECTION 1. FINDINGS.**

4 Congress finds the following:

5 (1) The United States takes affirmative meas-  
6 ures to conceal the identity of covert agents of the  
7 Central Intelligence Agency as a matter of national  
8 security.



F:\M9\INSLEE\INSLEE\_074.XML

H.L.C.

2

1 (2) On July 14, 2003, the identity of Valerie  
2 Plame Wilson as a covert agent of the Central Intel-  
3 ligence Agency was publicly exposed.

4 (3) As an individual whose identity has been ex-  
5 posed, Valerie Plame Wilson is no longer eligible to  
6 serve the Central Intelligence Agency as a covert  
7 agent and her employment opportunities within the  
8 Central Intelligence Agency are severely limited.

9 (4) Employees of the Central Intelligence Agen-  
10 cy are eligible for voluntary retirement after reach-  
11 ing a minimum age of 50 years and completing 20  
12 years of service.

13 (5) In January 2006, Valerie Plame Wilson will  
14 have been employed by the Central Intelligence  
15 Agency for 20 years and will be 42 years of age.

16 (6) Valerie Plame Wilson should be able to re-  
17 ceive retirement benefits from the Central Intel-  
18 ligence Agency after having been employed for 20  
19 years without meeting the minimum age require-  
20 ment.

21 **SEC. 2. VOLUNTARY RETIREMENT FROM THE CENTRAL IN-**  
22 **TELLIGENCE AGENCY.**

23 For the purposes of section 233 of the Central Intel-  
24 ligence Agency Retirement Act (50 U.S.C. 2053), Valerie  
25 Plame Wilson of Washington, District of Columbia, is



F:\M9\INSLEE\INSLEE\_074.XML

H.L.C.

3

1 deemed to meet the minimum age requirement for vol-  
2 untary retirement of 50 years of age as provided in such  
3 section.



-----Original Message-----

From: Joseph Wilson [mailto:[thewilsonswdc@hotmail.com](mailto:thewilsonswdc@hotmail.com)]


Sent: Tuesday, November 15, 2005 4:40 PM

To: Bonlender, Brian

Subject: RE: FW: Draft 3: Plame relief

brian -

valerie here. please forgive our delayed response as life has been crazed lately...

a few notes: i gave my "notice" last week. i resign on 2jan06 with  years of service. i have been working on a draft memo that asks for my annuity immediately (vice age 60) for all the reasons we know... still trying to figure out to whom that should go. ultimately to opm for final decision, i believe.

we will need a final decision on that memo PRIOR to submitting any legislation, i should think (all other avenues of recourse have been attempted, etc...)

as for any republican members who might consider co-sponsoring....hmmmm...let me ask joe and we will get back to you.

just wanted to check in and give you an update.

we are both so, so appreciative of your office and jay's work on this issue.

best, Valerie

From: "Bonlender, Brian" <Brian.Bonlender@mail.house.gov>  
To: "'Joseph Wilson'" <thewilsonswdc@hotmail.com>  
Subject: RE: FW: Draft 3: Plame relief  
Date: Tue, 15 Nov 2005 19:48:51 -0500

Valerie,

Thanks for getting back to me, and no problem on the delay. I understand that you all must be busy at there is a lot to consider here.

I think it does make sense to pursue other avenues and show that you are seeking non legislative solutions first, as some may claim it is a political effort. However, you may not want to commit yourself to waiting for a final decision from OPM or the CIA. That could be some time because of both political and/or bureaucratic reasons.

You may want to add in your memo a request that they make their decision in a timely manner (for many of the same reasons given for your request). By putting a date in there, you can have a built in trigger for pursuing other options. I'm not sure what a reasonable timeframe would be though.

I also still think there is some chance that the R's will pass this at some point. As the Libby trial goes on, and depending on Rove's fate, I can see the R's looking to put some space between them and a White House that is not up for election. This may be a vehicle for them to do that. I'm not saying that this is a rationale for pursuing a legislative solution, but that it is a dynamic in Congress that could provide an opening for success.

I don't mean to push you one way or another, just give you something to think about. I see no reason to rush, as this situation will be salient for some time.

-Brian



-----Original Message-----

From: Joseph Wilson [mailto:[thewilsonswdc@hotmail.com](mailto:thewilsonswdc@hotmail.com)]

Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2005 2:11 PM

To: Bonlender, Brian

Subject: RE: FW: Draft 3: Plame relief

brian -

all good points, especially the time frame. thank you.

will keep you posted on the memo's progress and speak with joe about some possible co-sponsors.

did you like the piece about woodward in the post today? i had no idea that i was so populare that all the top ranking wh officials had my name on their lips...

best, valerie

From: "Bonlender, Brian" <Brian.Bonlender@mail.house.gov>  
To: "'Joseph Wilson'" <thewilsonswdc@hotmail.com>  
Subject: RE: FW: Draft 3: Plame relief  
Date: Thu, 17 Nov 2005 13:46:12 -0500

Another option would be for Jay to send a letter to the CIA or OPM following your memo to ask that they expedite their consideration due to the circumstances. Then we could put a date in that letter to use as a timeframe for legislation.

Regarding Woodward, I was a bit surprised. I guess there is a price to pay for access.

Brian

-----Original Message-----

From: Joseph Wilson [mailto:[thewilsonswdc@hotmail.com](mailto:thewilsonswdc@hotmail.com)]

Sent: Monday, November 28, 2005 4:57 PM

To: Bonlender, Brian

Subject: RE: FW: Draft 3: Plame relief

greetings, brian.

hope your thanksgiving holiday was enjoyable and peaceful.

i pretty much have final word from the agency that because of the statutory nature of the resignation/retirement regulations, no one at the agency, or opm for that matter, has the authority to grant a waiver to my request for an immediate annuity. there is some question as to whether i would be eligible to receive my annuity at 56 or 62. in any case, the agency will give me an "official" memo to that effect. see my attached memo which i had the office of general counsel review.

joe suggested ed royce of california as a possible r who might co-sponsor this legislation. he also suggested that your office contact rush holt to see if he has any ideas of someone on the intel committee who might be willing to put his name to it.

you may know that we'll be seeing jay and trudi for dinner on sunday night and we can chat more then. joe and i are so appreciative of the work you are doing on our behalf.

best, valerie

TO:

FROM:

Effective January 2, 2006, I will resign from the Agency after [REDACTED]. This difficult decision came after only a great deal of thought and reflection as I have been honored to serve my country and the Agency and was devoted to my career. However, I believe that recent events have placed an insurmountable burden upon my career and my ability to effectively continue my service. The July 2003 disclosure of my name and true employer in the national media and subsequent sensationalized publicity have made it impossible to continue in the career path for which I was trained and to which I have devoted my career. Security concerns now preclude me from serving overseas and my upward advancement has been severely compromised, if not precluded by the intense politicization of the leak investigation. As been acknowledged by the Agency and by senior public officials, I was neither informed that senior officials would disclose my identity nor was the disclosure consistent with Agency procedures. However, the immediate effect was to render my continued service in any meaningful or productive manner impossible. It is with deep regret that I end my career with the Agency notwithstanding my passionate belief in its mission and that of its Counterproliferation Division.

Under current Agency regulations, I will resign as a GS14/6 and be eligible for a gross annuity of approximately \$21,744 at age 60 under my retirement program "FERS Special". I am 42 years old and therefore I understand that under normal rules I am not eligible to the retirement benefits available at age 50 and [REDACTED]. I hereby request that consideration be given to an exception to this policy. As I have noted, and as is unfortunately widely known, my resignation is occasioned not by any act or desire of my own but rather because of actions by senior government officials in providing my name and cover. These disclosures were confirmed by the Agency spokesperson. While I understand that the Agency may have had no option and greatly appreciate the fact that the Agency referred this matter to the Department of Justice to determine the source of this disclosure, the fact of this disclosure has nevertheless had a devastating effect upon my career. In effect, the public disclosures have served to eliminate my position and ability to continue my job. Due to these unique circumstances, and my own absolute lack of culpability in them, I am hereby requesting that I be granted age credits so that I may retire on the basis that I am 50 years old and therefore begin to collect my annuity immediately. On top of the loss of my career, requiring that I wait 18 years to begin to collect my annuity places an added and unfair burden and penalty upon me. I believe that these unique circumstances warrant the Agency's review of this situation.

From: "Bonlender, Brian" <[Brian.Bonlender@mail.house.gov](mailto:Brian.Bonlender@mail.house.gov)>  
To: "'Joseph Wilson'" <[thewilsonswdc@hotmail.com](mailto:thewilsonswdc@hotmail.com)>  
Subject: RE: FW: Draft 3: Plame relief  
Date: Mon, 28 Nov 2005 17:54:23 -0500

Valerie,

Sorry to hear that the CIA is being unflexible on this.

I'll talk to Jay about reaching Royce, and we'll certainly work on either Holt or somebody else on the IR committee. I think this bill will go to the Government Reform Committee, so we'll have to get Waxman or somebody else on it too.

I should be seeing you both on Sunday, as I will likely be joining you all for dinner.

See you soon,

Brian

-----Original Message-----

From: Joseph Wilson [mailto:[thewilsonswdc@hotmail.com](mailto:thewilsonswdc@hotmail.com)]

Sent: Monday, December 05, 2005 4:11 PM

To: Bonlender, Brian

Subject: RE: FW: Draft 3: Plame relief

brian -

i enjoyed meeting you again last night - a fun, enjoyable evening.  
thankyou from both joe and myself.

do you have a number where i can reach you at work tomorrow? i want to  
talkto you about this potential legislation and related issues.

best, valerie

From: "Bonlender, Brian" < [Brian.Bonlender@mail.house.gov](mailto:Brian.Bonlender@mail.house.gov) >  
To: "'Joseph Wilson'" <[thewilsonswdc@hotmail.com](mailto:thewilsonswdc@hotmail.com)>  
Subject: RE: FW: Draft 3: Plame relief  
Date: Mon, 5 Dec 2005 16:47:57 -0500

Great to see you two as well.

You can call my direct number at 202-226-7451. If you get my voicemail, you can then dial "0" and ask the front desk person to interrupt me if I'm in a meeting or on the phone. Or, just leave a message, and I'll get back with you.

Talk to you soon,

Brian

-----Original Message-----

From: Joseph Wilson [mailto:[thewilsonswdc@hotmail.com](mailto:thewilsonswdc@hotmail.com)]

Sent: Sunday, February 26, 2006 12:26 PM

To: Bonlender, Brian

Subject: RE: FW: Draft 3: Flame relief

brian -

is it too late the year to say happy 2006? hope your holidays were enjoyable. i am so happy to be unemployed - the stress in our lives has dropped significantly. of course, it's just a matter of time until the next round..

i just wanted to follow up and let you know that on 10 february, the agency sent me an official letter stating that they resolved the issue of when i was eligible for an annuity. according to them, i am eligible to receive approximately \$1,795 per month when i turn 56. i will be happy to fax you the actual letter, if it would be helpful.

i realize none of this will go forward if/until there is a new congress with the dems in charge. just wanted to keep you updated.

please give my best to jay and we'll be in touch soon.

thank you for all your help on this. valerie



From: "Bonlender, Brian" <[Brian.Bonlender@mail.house.gov](mailto:Brian.Bonlender@mail.house.gov)>  
To: "'Joseph Wilson'" <[thewilsonswdc@hotmail.com](mailto:thewilsonswdc@hotmail.com)>  
Subject: RE: FW: Draft 3: Plame relief  
Date: Mon, 27 Feb 2006 20:09:55 -0500

Valerie,

Happy New Year to you too! Glad to hear that things are calming down a bit for you.

Are you interested in us taking Congressional action on this?

Best,

Brian

-----Original Message-----

From: Joseph Wilson [mailto:[thewilsonswdc@hotmail.com](mailto:thewilsonswdc@hotmail.com)]

Sent: Tuesday, February 28, 2006 10:57 AM

To: Bonlender, Brian

Subject: RE: FW: Draft 3: Plame relief

brian,

joe and i would be both humbled and so grateful if your office were to take on this "cause". however, we always figured it would wait until after the november elections to see if the balance shifts and makes it an easier task.

what is your thinking on this? valerie

From: "Bonlender, Brian" <[Brian.Bonlender@mail.house.gov](mailto:Brian.Bonlender@mail.house.gov)>  
To: "'Joseph Wilson'" <[thewilsonswdc@hotmail.com](mailto:thewilsonswdc@hotmail.com)>  
Subject: RE: FW: Draft 3: Plame relief  
Date: Tue, 28 Feb 2006 13:25:00 -0500

I'll talk to Jay about it, but my feeling is that we should do it now, before the midterm elections. Either way, Bush is going to have to sign the thing into law, and chances that we take both chambers are still not the greatest.

My feeling is the best shot we have is to first try to get an R to work with us on this and try to make it relatively non-controversial. If that fails, we try to shame the R's into doing this, hoping that they will judge that either this is an opportunity to distance themselves from Bush and Libby, or they want to get the issue behind them.

Jay may have a different perspective though. I'll talk with him about it this evening when he arrives.

Brian